

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed May 14, 2008, considered and rejected claims 1-16 and 18-28. Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 1-16 and 18-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite. Claims 1-16 and 18-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lui* (U.S. Publ. No. 2002/0011993) in view of *Ditzik* (U.S. Patent No. 6,415,256).²

By this paper, claims 1-14 and 16 are amended, claim 29 is added, and claim 15 is cancelled, such that claims 1-14, 16 and 18-29 are pending, of which claims 1, 15, 16 and 28 are the only independent claims at issue.

1. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

As reflected above, claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, the Office states that the system is merely a set of instructions capable of being executed, but does not assert a program stored on computer-readable storage medium so as to be structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium. Applicant notes that claims 1-14 have each been amended to specifically recite a computer-readable storage medium. In view of at least the above, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is overcome.

2. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

As also reflected above, various claims were rejected as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. More specifically, claims 1 and 16 recited a definition of an input scope as a subset of language used to define what one or more words, numbers, or punctuations can be written, and in what order they may be written, to form a sequence of text characters in a text input field, and the Office rejected the claims on the basis that "may be" and "can be" make it unclear what is part of the claimed invention.

In support, the Office cites to M.P.E.P. § 2173.05(d) which notes various examples of exemplary language held to be indefinite. While not noted in the Action, such a section also

² Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

states, however, that claim language is "fact specific" and cannot therefore be applied as *per se* rules. Applicant notes that when the claim language is considered on a fact basis, there was no ambiguity as to the claims. In particular, a definition of an input scope merely set forth, as would be understood by one skilled in the art, which words, number or punctuations are writable and in what order they are writable. The claims did not recite that certain aspects "can include" or "may include" which could potentially cause some uncertainty as to what elements are actually included in the claim, but merely what aspects can be written and in what order they can be written. Nevertheless, to expedite prosecution, Applicant has amended the claims to recite that the words, numbers or punctuations are allowed to be written and the order in which they are allowed to be written, thereby rendering the rejection moot. Applicant notes, however, that the amended claims are synonymous with the claim language previously used, such that no change in claim scope has been made.

3. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

As reflected in the above claims, the pending claims are directed to methods and computer readable media for providing context to an input method, and to allow input methods to achieve higher accuracy recognition for text input. As reflected in claim 16, for example, a method for improving such recognition rates includes invoking, by executable software code, a first application programming interface (API) for setting input scopes for a plurality of text fields for an application. An input scope itself is a subset of language used to define what one or more words, numbers or punctuations can be written and in what order they may occur to form a sequence of characters in a text field. The method also includes using a first API to set a first input scope for a first text field of the application, the first input scope being chosen from multiple available input scopes that include at least a list of input scopes, a list of words/phrases, a common input scope, or a custom input scope. The first API is also used to set a second input scope for a second text field of the application, and which second input scope is chosen from the multiple available input scopes, and which is different from the first input scope for the first text field. A second API is invoked by a recognizer for obtaining one or more of the input scopes set for the text fields of the application. The second API is then used to apply the first input scope set for the first field such that as a first sequence of text characters are entered, they are compared with the first input scope to determine what text is expected. The second API is used

to apply the second input scope for the second text field. Claims 1 recites a computer-readable storage medium having instructions thereon which are capable of performing a similar method.

While *Ditzik* and *Lui* generally relate to handwriting or other text input and/or recognition systems, Applicant respectfully submits that they fail, whether cited alone or in combination, to render the pending claims unpatentable. For example, the cited combination, at a minimum, fails to disclose or reasonably suggest a method in which an input scope is set that determines what words, numbers, or punctuations are allowed to be written, and in what order they are allowed to be written to form a text sequence in a text input field, as recited in combination with the other claim elements.

Applicant notes that the Office has noted that *Lui* is deficient in this regard, and thus has turned to the *Ditzik* reference to remedy such deficiencies. In particular, *Ditzik* discloses a handwriting and speed recognition system in which a pen/stylus input device is used to input text or other characters. That handwriting is then recognized and integrated into a display. In particular, the computer handwriting recognition system includes a pen or stylus input device and an electronic means for digitizing the pen strokes and recognizing the pen stroke data. (Col. 4, ll. 31-35). The system can take discrete or cursive handwriting and transform recognized letters, numbers, punctuation, and symbols into recognized computer generated text that is suitable for additional processing or storage. (Col. 4, ll. 35-41). In recognizing the handwriting, the obtained data is compared against databases that can include language dictionaries and writing rules. (Col. 4, ll. 44-51).

Notably, the only disclosure in *Ditzik* is that text is compared against language dictionaries and writing rules to determine what the text is. In contrast, the pending claims specifically recite use of input scopes that define not only what words, numbers, and/or punctuations are allowed, but the order that they are allowed to be written in the particular text input field. At most, *Ditzik* can be read to recognize text based on what is in a dictionary or grammar book, but has no disclosure or support for recognizing text based in any part on what order words, numbers, or punctuations are allowed to be written, as recited in combination with the other claim elements.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the

purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (801) 533-9800.

Dated this 29th day of October, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,

/Colby C. Nuttall, Reg. # 58146/

RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
COLBY C. NUTTALL
Registration No. 58,146
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 047973

RDN:CCN:gd